THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JULY, 1915

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and thirty Branch Committees; 33,105 members in 423 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, President
MRS. GEORGE R AGASSIZ.
MISS MARY S. AMES.
MRS. JOHN BALCH.
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY.
MISS ANNA L. DAWES.
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL.
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY.
Vice-Presidents
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MRS. EDWIN FORD, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y., Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

** Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

"YOUR GIRL AND MINE"

MASSACHUSETTS suffragists have done no more unscrupulous thing than to exhibit over the state the moving picture film, "Your Girl and Mine."

The story of this film involves a poor working girl, a shiftless husband, and a male villain or two, and its aim is to appeal to the emotions by portraying the evils of laws which are unjust to women.

If these laws were Massachusetts laws, it might be permissible to use even lurid melodrama to direct attention to them.

But they are not Massachusetts laws, and "votes for women" in Massachusetts have no possible connection with them. They are not the laws of any single state. The statute books of all of the states have been searched, as with a fine-tooth comb, for material for the film. There is here a law from Texas, there one from Georgia, and again one from New Mexico, and so on.

We are making great progress in remedial and protective legislation. But it would be strange if, in the legislation of forty-eight states, it were impossible to find some survivals of unjust laws. For that matter, quite an appealing motion picture film might be made out of unjust laws in suffrage states,—the Colorado law, which allows boys of any age to engage in street trades, the State of Washington law, which permits girls of ten to peddle or beg or sing on the street for gain, the Utah law, which allows girls of twelve to black shoes on the street. These laws compare but poorly with the laws for the protection of children in male-suffrage states.

In course of time, it may be hoped that all the states, suffrage or male-suffrage, which still lag behind in protective legislation, may wipe all unjust laws off their statute books. But it is a cheap political trick to scoop together such laws from various backward states, and bring them forward as a reason why Massachusetts men should vote for suffrage.

Even some of the more candid suffragists have felt compelled to protest against this policy, as appears from the following article in "Femina":

It is to be hoped that thinking suffragists—is the adjective ever necessary?—will realize that the use of the film, "Your Girl and Mine," if used as propaganda in the coming campaign in this State, will hinder far more than help their cause. It is a lurid melodrama in which every man (save one) is a villain, and every woman and child completely at his mercy. While conditions, as represented, are true in certain States, the coming campaign seeks converts among men of Massachusetts, and in their eyes the presentation of conditions not existing here, casts a grave doubt upon the sincerity and even truthfulness of the suffrage aspirant. * * * If they are to be won, it must be by an appeal to reason; by a correct presentation of the many ways in which Massachusetts' laws can be improved by the woman's vote.

TO MASSACHUSETTS MEN

DO YOU HAPPEN TO KNOW

Of any case on record where the ballot was forced upon any class or group of people against their will? This is exactly what Massachusetts suffragists are trying to do.

Of any State in the Union where the laws are more just or give better protection to women and children? Put Massachusetts laws beside those of any suffrage state, and see what you think about it.

Of any State where the men show more consideration for the women, or treat them more fairly?

WHAT DO YOU THINK

Of the suffragist attempt to create sex antagonism by insisting that Massachusetts women need "justice" more than "chivalry" and are unfairly treated and oppressed?

Of the suffragists using the social evil as an argument for their cause, promising that it would disappear if women had the vote, when, as a matter of fact, it is as flagrant in suffrage as in non-suffrage states?

Of the suffragist claim that women, — without experience, without training, without practical knowledge of the chief concerns of government — are sure to make better voters and lawmakers than men?

DON'T BE DECEIVED

The suffragists are voluble and vehement. They will promise you anything. But you will best serve the women of Massachusetts BY VOTING "NO" ON THE AMENDMENT.

ANTI-SUFFRAGE SIGNS

PASSENGERS who take a subway train at the "Washington" station find confronting them, in letters so conspicuous that those who run may read, the following sign:

STAND BY THE WOMEN
VOTE NO ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE
WOMAN'S RIGHT IS THE RIGHT OF FREEDOM FROM POLITICAL DUTIES
LESS THAN 10 PER CENT. OF MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN WANT TO VOTE
Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

Passengers who leave a subway train at "Harvard" to take a street car for North Cambridge, Arlington or Upland Road are faced by an attractively lettered sign, which reads:

VOTE "NO" ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE
LESS THAN 10 PER CENT. OF THE WOMEN WANT IT
DOUBLING THE VOTE MEANS HIGHER TAXES
MASSACHUSETTS HAS BETTER LAWS THAN ANY SUFFRAGE STATE
THE POLITICAL INTERESTS OF MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN ARE SAFE WITH MASSACHUSETTS MEN
WOMAN SUFFRAGE THREATENS THE HOME
Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association
SAFETY FIRST

The first sign is paid for by the Chestnut Hill Branch of the Association; the second by the Cambridge, Arlington, Lexington and Winchester Branches. Both are signed by two officers of the State Association, in compliance with the law regarding appeals to voters.

Any of the Branches of the Massachusetts Association might well copy and post conspicuously in their neighborhood, during the months previous to the election, either of these signs, or might use any equally compact statement of the anti-suffrage argument. But it should be borne in mind that there must be in every case, in addition to the name of the Association, the names of two individuals.

Every such sign will be a continuing reminder to voters, through the campaign, of the real issues at stake, and will prompt them to "Stand by the Women" and to seek "Safety First."

"THE PITFALL OF THE FEMINIST"

IN the extract from Miss Repplier's striking article on "Women and War," in the May Atlantic Monthly, printed elsewhere in this number of THE REMONSTRANCE, there is no sentence more true or of wider application than this: "The pitfall of the feminist is the belief that the interests of men and women can ever be severed."

Miss Repplier applies this sentence to the childish and irrational assumption that battle is a game, played by men at the expense of women, and that women endure all the pain and men enjoy all the pleasure; and she emphasizes the fact that the men who are fighting in Europe to-day are not destitute of natural affection for their wives and children, but that the protection of the family is, and always has been, a factor in war.

But Miss Repplier's sentence has a wider application. It characterizes accurately the fundamental error of the suffragists. Their cause actually rests upon this belief as a basis,—that the interests of men and women are not only severed, but hostile; that women are the victims of grave injustice, and need the ballot to protect themselves; and that men generally, if not universally, are ready to sacrifice the welfare of women to promote their own ends.

If any one doubts the truth of this statement, he has only to follow the arguments of the Massachusetts suffragists in the present campaign to be convinced of its accuracy. Suffrage oratory, in public halls and at street corners, has this for its burden. When Margaret Foley, in the suffrage parade, flaunted the flag "We want justice, not chivalry," this is what she meant. She conceded that Massachusetts women are treated with a respect and consideration which she chose to fling aside as mere "chivalry," but she insisted that they were denied justice. This is the key-note of the suffragists' campaign. Unable to show that Massachusetts legislators are indifferent to the protection of women and girls, they have brought on a worker from New York Chinatown, and have exploited her harrowing stories of wrong in the interest of their cause. Unable to point to Massachusetts laws which are unjust to women, they have exhibited all over the state a sensational film, "Your Girl and Mine," which scrapes together and luridly portrays objectionable laws in some of the more backward states.

If these appeals, and others like them, do not win the support of the average man, it is because he knows that the sex-antagonism on which they are based is a myth. He knows that the interests of his wife, his mother, his daughter, his sister are as dear to him as his own, that, in fact, they are his own. He toils for them, sacrifices for them, lives for them. Anything that injures them injures him. He does not need a suffrage orator, in an automobile decked with yellow ribbons, to urge upon him the necessity of pure milk for his children, of sanitation for his home, of righteous laws for the protection of his wife and daughters. To be told that his interests are in any way severed from theirs, still more that they are hostile to theirs, only arouses his contempt for a cause which tries to propagate itself by such methods.

So it comes to pass that the suffrage movement in Massachusetts is headed straight for its pitfall, under considerable momentum.

ELIZABETH H. HOUGHTON

ONCE more the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts finds itself obliged to report a great loss,—the death of Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton of Cambridge, long a valued member of the Executive Committee.

In the early days of anti-suffrage activity, long before this Association was formed, Mrs. Henry O. Houghton was one of the handful of women who took part in the opposition; and, on her death, her daughter was wisely selected to fill her place.

In all the years that have passed since then, and amid all the ever-increasing interest in the subject, Miss Houghton has been earnest and faithful, constant in her attendance at meetings, and ever ready to carry out any suggestions possible. Somewhat shy in expressing her opinions, she yet had very decided ones as to what should or should not be done, and her judgment was sound and to be relied upon. She had a great dislike for the personalities which sometimes seemed necessary, and always tried to see the best in every one.

Miss Houghton's wide acquaintance through her many interests,—in the Consumers' League, of which she was long the head, in the Woman's Auxiliary to the Episcopal Board of Missions, where she will be sadly missed, in the Cambridge Hospital League, in the Associated Charities, in the activities of the Boys' Club of the Social Union of which she was the founder, and, not to be forgotten, in the great Publishing House in which her family had so large a part,—made her especially valuable, and she was constantly called upon for information and advice.

Her place in the Association cannot be filled, and her associates, especially those long connected with her, feel that they have lost a loyal friend as well as a faithful worker.

The great outpouring of friends at her funeral in Christ Church, Cambridge, on the 23d of May, showed the estimation in which she was held.

SOME OMITTED INCIDENTS

THE Woman's Journal gave five or six columns of space to a report of the Women's Peace Conference at The Hague. But, generous as this allotment of space was, the Journal did not find room for one or two significant incidents.

The Journal's report says:

"The business session of the third day of the International Congress of Women came to a dramatic climax when Mrs. Rosika Schwimmer of Hungary, after having requested the audience to rise for a silent tribute to the dead on the battlefields, urged the nations of the world to make an end to the war, to begin peace negotiations, and to effect a settlement based upon justice. Unanimously the delegates endorsed her fervid plea."

But, between Mrs. Schwimmer's speech and the action of the delegates, something happened, which seems to have been blue-penciled from the Journal's report. This is what it was, according to the Associated Press report:

"Mlle. Hammer, of the Belgian delegation, thereupon asked permission to utter a few words. When this was granted, she astounded her audience with the dramatic exclamation:

"'I am a Belgian, and I cannot think as you do. There can be no peace without justice. The war must continue until the Belgians' wrongs have been righted. There must be no mediation except at the bar of justice.'

"General sympathy for the suffering of the Belgians caused part of the audience to break into cheers."

In response to this pathetic appeal, on motion of Miss Holbrook of Chicago, the word "justice" was inserted in the resolution before it was put to vote.

Earlier in the same session, there was another incident, which is omitted from the Journal's report. Mrs. Amy Lillingston of London got the floor, and said:

"I was a suffragist and I remain a suffragist. I suffered in jail for it. I am just a plain English working woman, but I represent millions of women who favor the present just war as much as do the men. One hundred and eighty women are said to be waiting at Tilbury to come to this congress to talk peace. For every one of those, a thousand English women are willing to accompany their sons and husbands to fight. We are tired of the century-old silly platitudes such as are uttered here."

At this point, Mrs. Lillingston was ruled out of order. But she had said enough, in connection with Mlle. Hammer's protest, to make it clear that there is not the radical difference between women and men which the suffragists insist upon, when issues of right and justice and patriotism and sacrifices for home and country are involved.

"THE LAST LAP"

SOME of the suffrage leaders seem to be disconcerted by the ardor with which their Socialist allies espouse their cause. But the New York Call, the Socialist organ, goes right on exhorting its readers to push the campaign for woman suffrage. It says:

The opportunity for the Socialist voters at the next election is too good to be overlooked or neglected. So far, we have not helped much, and our woman Comrades have every reason to emphasize that fact, for though it may be explained, explanation is not justification. But in these matters it is never too late to help. The last lap is being run, and the Socialist voters should use extra and special efforts to push the cause of woman suffrage past the winning post. It needs now nothing more than voting and inducing others to vote, and that should come easy, for it is in no way more than a customary part of our propaganda.

THE theory that woman suffrage is a question that ought to be decided by individual male electors The Suffragist denounces as "absolutely false and hurtful." What The Suffragist wants is to wheedle legislatures without consulting the voters.

WOMEN AND WAR

(Miss Agnes Repplier in The Atlantic Monthly for May)

We find women to-day talking and writing as if none of their sex had anything at stake in the defense of their violated homes, as if they had no sacred rights bound up with the sacred rights of men. The National American Woman Suffrage Association sent last autumn an appeal to organized suffragists all over the world, urging them to "arise in protest, and show war-crazed men that between the contending armies there stand thousands of women and children who are the innocent victims of man's unbridled ambitions."

There was no word in this appeal to indicate that any nobler—and humbler—sentiment than unbridled ambition (which, after all, is for the very few) animates the soldier's heart. There was no distinction drawn between aggressive and defensive warfare. There was no hint that men bear their full share of the sufferings caused by war. The assumption that women endure all the pain is in accordance with the assumption that men enjoy all the pleasure. To write as though battle were a game, played by men at the expense of women, is childish and irrational. We Americans are happily spared the sight of mangled soldiers lying in undreamed-of agony on the frozen field. We do not see the ghastly ambulance trains jolting along with their load of broken, tortured men; or the hospitals where these wrecks are nursed back to some poor remnant of life, or escape through the merciful gates of death. But we might read of these things; we might visualise them in moments of comfortable leisure, and take shame to our souls at the platform eloquence which so readily assumes that the sorrows of war are hidden in women's hearts, that the burdens of war are laid upon women's shoulders, that women are sacrificed in their helplessness to the hatred and the ambitions, the greed and the glory of men. . . .

It is possible for an American woman to have no quarrel with any one, no knowledge of what Europe is quarreling about, and no human concern as to which nations win. But she should not think, and she certainly should not say, that the women of the warring lands are equally ignorant, and equally unconcerned. The Servian woman no doubt cares a great deal for the freedom of her hard-pressed, bravely defended country. The French woman cares with her whole soul for the preservation of France. The Belgian woman can hardly be indifferent to the ultimate fate of Belgium. It is even possible that the English and German women are not prepared to clasp each other's hands and say, "We are sisters, and it matters nothing to us whether England or Germany wins." The pitfall of the feminist is the belief that the interests of men and women can ever be severed; that what brings suffering to the one can leave the other unscathed.

THE CHICAGO ELECTION

It is rather diverting to find the suffragists claiming that it was the women's vote which carried the day for William H. Thompson, the successful candidate for Mayor in Chicago; when the fact is that, if the women had had their way, he would not have been a candidate at all. At the primary, the majority of the Republican women voted for his competitor, Judge Olssen.

At the election, all accounts agree that "the women's votes were divided between the candidates in about the same proportion as the men's."

The fact is that Mr. Thompson, the successful candidate, polled a larger percentage of men's votes than of women's. The men gave him 63.1 per cent. of the total Republican and Democratic vote. The women gave him only 61.8 per cent.

Close analysis of the returns of the election for aldermen shows that in only two wards out of thirty-eight did the women's votes affect in the least the result. In those two wards, the 18th and 22nd, the candidates chosen would not have been elected by the men's votes. This seems rather a meagre result of the political activities of 243,000 women. It is to be noticed that "Hinky Dink" McKenna found the women's vote no more of an obstacle than his "pal" "Bathhouse John," last year. He ran far ahead of the Mayoralty ticket of his party, and was reelected by 4,000 plurality.

The suffragists have made much of the fact that the women polled 86 per cent. of their registration, and the men polled 88 per cent. of theirs, the conclusion being that the women showed practically as much interest as the men. But this comparison ignores altogether the disproportion between qualified voters and registered voters in the two sexes. The male population of Chicago outnumbers the female by about 6 per cent. If the actual division of the sexes had been reflected in the voting, the number of male voters should have exceeded the number of female voters by only 6 per cent. But the total of male votes cast was, in round numbers, 426,000; the total of female votes was only 243,000. Here is a difference of 75 per cent. In other words, if the qualified women voters had voted in as large a proportion as the men, their vote should have been about 400,000 instead of 243,000.

These plain and indisputable facts are commended to the consideration of those who may have been misled by the suffragists' claim that the Chicago election demonstrated the value of women's votes. What it did demonstrate was a large diversion of women's strength to political activities, at an enormous cost and without any appreciable result.

Commenting upon the tragedy of the Lusitania and President Wilson's note to Germany, in an interview reported in the Boston Advertiser of May 15, Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont said:

"I can't help thinking that that note to Germany wouldn't have been written even now, if nobody but some poor steerage passengers had been lost. The fact that it took the death of a very wealthy citizen of the United States to bring a protest is a poor commentary on our government. But the United States is snobbish—snobbish and commercial."

If Mrs. Belmont "can't help thinking" such petty and spiteful things as that, she should resist the temptation to utter them.

THE course of the suffrage movement in the legislatures this year has by no means been one of unbroken triumph, as might be supposed from the exuberant suffrage congratulations. The suffragists have secured favorable action in second legislatures in five states, which brings the question to the polls in New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania this year and in Iowa next year; they have induced the South Dakota legislature to resubmit the amendment which was defeated at the polls last November by a majority of 11,914; they have carried the West Virginia legislature, which will take their amendment to the people next year; and the Tennessee legislature has acted favorably on the amendment, but there the approval of a second legislature is necessary, and the measure cannot be carried to the polls before 1918, at the earliest. On the other hand, as the list printed below shows, they have been disappointed in no less than nineteen legislatures.

SUFFRAGE DEFEATS THIS YEAR

IN CONGRESS

In the House of Representatives, January 12, the proposed suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution was defeated by a vote of 174 yeas to 204 nays, with 57 Representatives not recorded. In a full House, the suffragists would have needed 290 votes to carry the amendment. They fell 116 short of that. On the vote recorded, they needed 252 votes. They fell 78 short of that.

IN THE LEGISLATURES

In Alabama, the suffrage amendment for which the suffragists had made an active campaign, did not get out of committee.

In Arkansas, the suffrage amendment was crowded out by the provision that only three constitutional amendments can be submitted at one time.

In Connecticut, the proposed amendment was defeated in the House by a vote of 106 yeas to 124 nays.

In Delaware, the proposed amendment was defeated in the House by a vote of 8 yeas to 22 nays, and in the Senate by 6 yeas to 11 nays.

In Florida, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated.

In Illinois, the resolution for a constitutional convention, for which the suffragists labored, in the expectation that the convention, if it met, would make full suffrage one of its chief considerations, failed to pass the House after receiving a nearly unanimous vote in the Senate.

In Indiana, a limited suffrage bill, after the Illinois model, was defeated.

In Maine, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated in the House.

In Michigan, the suffrage attempt to secure the enactment of a limited suffrage bill failed because the bill was found to be unconstitutional.

In Minnesota, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated in the Senate.

In Missouri, the attempt to persuade the Legislature to resubmit the suffrage amendment which was defeated at the polls last year by a majority of 140,206 failed.

In Nebraska, a limited suffrage bill was defeated.

In New Hampshire, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 121 yeas to 230 nays, an adverse majority of nearly two to one.

In North Carolina, a proposed suffrage amendment was indefinitely postponed by the House by a vote of 68 to 39.

In North Dakota, the proposed suffrage amendment, which passed the 1913 legislature, came up for the required action by a second legislature, but was tabled in the Senate by a vote of 26 to 21.

In Oklahoma, the proposed suffrage amendment was indefinitely postponed in the Senate.

In Rhode Island, a presidential suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 65 to 31.

In Vermont, a combined presidential and municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 129 to 100.

In Wisconsin, the resolution providing for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the electors was defeated in the House, April 20.

EX-GOVERNOR GUILD

MASSACHUSETTS anti-suffragists have lost a trusted friend and counsellor through the death of ex-Governor Curtis Guild, Jr. He was one of the leaders in the Men's Committee to which the conservative women of the State entrusted their cause when the suffrage referendum was taken twenty years ago; and in the intervening years the Massachusetts women who organized to oppose woman suffrage relied upon his advice and assistance. At the legislative hearing in February, 1914, his letter, which was read before the Committee, was one of the most forcible presentations of anti-suffrage arguments ever made at the State House. He grounded his opposition on the fact that our great failures in legislation are caused not so much by a vicious element among the voters as by abstention from voting and by emotional voting; and he argued that, if women were given the ballot, the hysterical and emotional vote, and the vote of the immoral and degenerate would be doubled without a single compensating benefit, for the stay-at-home vote would be more than doubled. These were words of wisdom which may well be heeded when the issue comes before the voters next November.

ONE SLANDER DISPOSED OF

To the absurd statement, for which Mrs. Ida Husted Harper stands sponsor, that the liquor interests of Massachusetts have decided to spend $8,000,000 to finance the anti-suffrage campaign in this state, the following official denial has been made by Mrs. James M. Codman, President and Treasurer of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, and Mr. Augustin H. Parker, Treasurer of the Men's Committee of the Anti-Suffrage Association:

Not only have the liquor interests not contributed or offered to contribute or promised to contribute $8,000,000 or $1,000,000, or one dollar or any sum whatever to the anti-suffrage campaign in Massachusetts, but such contributions or any contribution, if offered by the liquor interests, would not be accepted by the anti-suffragists of Massachusetts.

The anti-suffragists of Massachusetts have tried to make it as clear and emphatic as they can that they have not asked, do not want, and will not accept any financial assistance from the liquor interests in their fight to prevent the imposition of the suffrage upon the women of Massachusetts; and they now defy anyone anywhere to produce one scintilla of evidence tending to prove the contrary.

The Anti-Suffrage Campaign

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

Over six hundred members and delegates from different parts of the state attended the luncheon and annual meeting of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, at the Hotel Somerset on the 20th of April. Mrs. James M. Codman, who presided, reviewed the action of various state legislatures this year upon suffrage proposals, showing that, while these proposals had been favored in eight legislatures, they had been defeated in nineteen. She predicted the rejection of the suffrage amendment next November. Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, chairman of the Education and Organization Committee, reported the present membership of the Association as 31,160, and the number of branch committees as 123, a gain of 35 during the year. The gain in membership for the year was 7,748. This was a net gain, after deducting deaths, removals from the state and resignations. Mrs. A. J. George, Field Secretary of the Association, who had just returned from a trip through the suffrage campaign states, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, expressed her confidence that the suffrage amendments would be defeated in those states; and pointed to the results of the attempted political blacklisting by suffragists as one of the most significant evidences of the popular reaction against "votes for women." Encouraging reports were made by Mrs. A. H. Parker, chairman of the County Committee, and by Miss Dorothy Godfrey, State Organizer; and Mr. Robert N. Turner, representing the Men's Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, reported upon the campaign work of that organization, and urged upon the women their individual responsibility in working for the defeat of the suffrage amendment. The following officers were elected: Mrs. James M. Codman, President; Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Miss Mary S. Ames, Mrs. John Balch, Mrs. Robert S. Bradley, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell and Mrs. Henry M. Whitney, Vice-Presidents; Mrs. James M. Codman, Treasurer; Mrs. Edwin Ford, Recording Secretary; Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Corresponding Secretary; Mrs. Edward B. Cole, Mrs. James D. Colt, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Mrs. Augustin H. Parker, Miss E. C. Post, Miss Julia Prendergast, Mrs. William L. Putnam, Mrs. Benjamin L. Robinson, Mrs. Richard M. Saltonstall, Miss Evelyn Sears, Miss Elizabeth P. Sohier, Miss Ellen M. Tower, Mrs. Barrett Wendell and Mrs. Henry P. White, Executive Committee; Miss Katharine E. Guild, Miss Sarah E. Hunt, Miss Elizabeth McCracken, Mrs. William T. Sedgwick and Mrs. G. Howland Shaw, Honorary Members of the Executive Committee.

ANTI-SUFFRAGE RALLY AT FANEUIL HALL

The evening of May 1, the day of the Suffragist and Socialist parades in New York, and the Socialist parade in Boston, was appropriately chosen for an anti-suffrage mass meeting in Faneuil Hall, which filled that historic assembling-place with an enthusiastic audience. Mr. John A. Sullivan, who presided, declared that woman suffrage would be a distinct detriment; it would not increase the wages of a single worker, and would not result in the passage of better health laws, food laws and social welfare laws. Massachusetts, he said, does not need woman suffrage to provide good legislation; she already has it. Whatever maladministration exists is due to ignorance on the part of voters: to adopt woman suffrage would be to admit as large a body of ignorant voters as we have today. You cannot solve a problem by making it twice as hard. Mr. J. Mitchell Galvin, the next speaker, opposed woman suffrage on the ground that it would interfere with the sacredness and happiness of the home. He believed that woman is too noble and too pure to be drawn into the vortex of politics. He did not believe that women wanted the ballot; and he did not believe in any system which would force it upon them. Mrs. A. J. George, who followed Mr. Galvin, gave numerous illustrations of the alliance between red Socialism and woman suffrage. She also quoted from suffrage literature extreme expressions, including doctrines of sex rights and the "free woman." She described the anti-suffrage cause as a patriotic movement of those who see in socialism and feminism the greatest menace we have in this country today; and who oppose woman suffrage because they do not believe in a social revolution. Mr. John A. Matthews, of New Jersey, the last speaker, began his address with a tribute to the late ex-Governor Guild. He reviewed the practical workings of woman suffrage in western states, quoting Judge Lindsey of Colorado and Judge Snell of Washington, and declared that the experience in these states and the nearer experience of Chicago point the warning finger, showing that you simply double the electorate and get no better results. There were some hisses from suffragists and socialists in the audience, at different stages of the meeting, but no serious disturbance. After the meeting broke up, suffragists began distributing literature to the crowd, and even attempted to hold a pro-suffrage meeting on the sidewalk, but were checked by the police in these violations of city ordinances.

A GREAT MEETING IN TREMONT TEMPLE

At the meeting in Tremont Temple, under the auspices of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, on the evening of May 15, the body of the hall and the first balcony were filled by an enthusiastic and responsive audience. Hon. Thomas J. Kenny of Boston presided: the speakers were Mr. Kenny, Alexander W. Samuel, Esq., Miss Marjorie Dorman of New York, and Hon. Robert Luce of Boston. There was music by the Commonwealth Band. Mr. Kenny declared that only a small percentage of Massachusetts women desire the ballot, and pointed to the fact that the women's school vote in January, 1914, was the smallest cast in thirty years, as proof of women's diminishing interest. He said that Massachusetts leads in all legislation favorable to working women, and in laws made by men to protect women and children, and added that Massachusetts standards had never been established from the mining camps and the divorce boroughs of Utah and Wyoming. Mr. Samuel, formerly a London barrister, dwelt with amusing sarcasm upon some of the eccentricities of the suf-

frage arguments, and said that, all through the suffrage agitation there was sex dissatisfaction, sex bitterness and sex hatred. Such an antagonism between women and men, he said, represents present degeneracy, and would lead to further degeneracy. This is no time, he urged, for sex warfare; it is the duty of all men and women to do their best. Miss Dorman, who spoke very effectively, with a blending of seriousness and humor, maintained that women have everything to lose and nothing to gain by accepting political equality with men. Already, in the male suffrage states, women workers in the various industries have all the protection which is given to men in the same industries, and special protection besides. Suffragists had promised higher wages to women when they got the vote, but women had lower wages in some of the suffrage states than elsewhere. Votes for women would double the electorate, and keep the relative strength of the classes the same. Mr. Luce denied that women would purify politics. He dwelt upon the lack of self-control shown by the suffrage leaders. Never once had they been able to control themselves at legislative hearings in this state. Five years ago, they hissed the President of the United States until he was obliged to tell them that, unless they could have self-control enough to allow of opposing arguments, they could not expect the responsibilities of citizenship. Mr. Luce replied to recent suffrage attacks upon Massachusetts laws; and he quoted from a feminist writer in The Forum, who predicted a time when "there will be no marrying or giving in marriage" and when "every woman will be a law unto herself." At this point, some of the suffragists justified Mr. Luce's criticisms of suffragist lack of self-control by jeering at the speaker, but checked themselves when he raised his hand, and advised them not to laugh at sentiments so destructive as those that he was reading.

A ROSE SUPPER

At Ford Hall, on the evening of May 27, more than 850 guests, men and women, were present at the Rose Supper of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. The arrangements were in charge of Mrs. Harold Murdock, chairman of the Chestnut Hill Branch. Twenty-one hostesses presided over the tables, and sixty anti-suffrage workers, dressed in white and wearing white Dutch caps with pink tops were waitresses. There were roses everywhere. Mr. William A. Murphy presided; and the speakers were Mrs. A. J. George, Miss Marjorie Dorman, and Senator John A. Matthews of New Jersey. Mr. Murphy declared that the suffrage question was a serious one, which should not be allowed to go by default, and he characterized the political woman as a dangerous proposition, capable of producing a most harmful state of affairs for the country. Mrs. George described the suffrage movement as a materialistic one; denounced the feminist teachings as setting at defiance the most sacred canons of Christian civilization; argued that the ballot was the least part of the suffrage agitation, and that the whole sweep of the relations of the sexes must be revised if the woman's vote is to mean anything more than two people doing what one person now does; and declared that women could not afford to have the shackles of economic and political equality with men placed upon them. Miss Dorman gave the woman workers' side of the anti-suffrage movement, and said that it is because women wage-earners believe that they have more to lose than to gain by accepting legal and political equality with men that they are joining the anti-suffrage organization in large numbers. "Woman," she said, "needs equality plus,"—she already has all the protective laws which men workers have, plus many special laws enacted for her protection: to be placed on a legal and political equality with men is the last thing desired by women who know what it means to punch a time clock. Mr. Matthews described the progress of the anti-suffrage movement in New Jersey, and predicted an overwhelming victory at the election on the 19th of October.

AN ENTHUSIASTIC STATE CONVENTION

THE Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Convention at Springfield, on the 9th and 10th of June, was one of the most successful and enthusiastic demonstrations of the campaign. It brought together more than four hundred delegates from all parts of the State. The programme included a reception and afternoon tea in the ball room of the Hotel Kimball, on the afternoon of the 9th, at which Mrs. Codman, President of the Anti-Suffrage Association, presided, Mrs. A. J. George made an address on "Why We Are Anti-Suffragists," and Dr. Ernest Bernbaum of Harvard University conducted a question box; a monster mass meeting in the Auditorium in the evening, at which Willard Scott of Brookline presided, and addresses were made by Dr. Bernbaum, Miss Marjorie Dorman, of the Wage Earners' League, New York City, and Hon. John A. Matthews of New Jersey; and a Conference in the Mahogany Room of the Municipal Building on the morning of the 10th, at which papers were read and brief addresses made by a number of delegates upon various aspects of the campaign. At the evening meeting, the delegates had the unexpected pleasure of welcoming Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President of the National Association, who was warmly applauded when she appeared on the platform. Great enthusiasm was shown by the audience of 1,500 or more, which assembled at the evening meeting, and the telling arguments of the speakers were received with warm applause.

In Mrs. George's very effective address at the afternoon reception, she said that anti-suffragists are in politics temporarily to keep out of it permanently; and among the reasons why they are anti-suffragists, she mentioned their conviction that to draft woman's energies into political activities would be a waste of power, because a duplication of effort; that the suffrage movement started wrong, on a basis of sex antagonism; that real political equality means a fair field with favor to none, which is the last thing that women want; and that woman suffrage is merely the political aspect of feminism, which looks forward to a social revolution.

Dr. Bernbaum reviewed and answered the arguments of Dr. Anna Shaw, especially her animadversions upon Massachusetts laws and people, and cited numerous particulars in which Massachusetts laws are far ahead of those of the suffrage states. Miss Dorman argued that woman suffrage struck at the very roots of efficiency by setting two sexes to doing the work which one sex is adequate to perform alone, and that the relative inexperience of women in business unfitted them for a share in the business of government; and, as proof that woman suffrage, when adopted by any state, not only wastes the time

and energy of its women, but wastes its taxes as well, she pointed to the fact that Colorado, after 23 years of suffrage, has the highest per capita tax of any state in the Union. Mr. Matthews contrasted Colorado laws and conditions with those of New Jersey and Massachusetts, and showed the groundlessness of suffragist claims as to the moral results to be expected from women's votes.

At the conference on the morning of the 10th, Mrs. George presided, and papers were read and addresses made by Miss Catherine Robinson, of Brookline, on "Some Things Women Have Gotten Without the Ballot;" by Mrs. Matthew Sullivan, of Canton, on "The Average Woman;" by Mrs. B. L. Robinson, of Cambridge, on "Woman Suffrage—A Menace to Social Reform;" by Mrs. Henry Preston White, of Brookline, on "Some Ways in Which Anti-Suffrage Arguments Can Be Brought Home to the People;" by Mrs. A. H. Parker, of Dover, on "The Organization of New Branches;" by Mrs. Frank Foxcroft, of Cambridge, on "Systematic Work to Reach Everybody," which Mrs. Edwin S. Chapin, of Cambridge, supplemented with some personal experiences; by Mrs. John Balch, of Milton, on "Financing the Work of Local Branches;" and by James D. Colt, Esq., of Boston, on "Laws Relating to Elections Which Must Be Observed During the Campaign."

TESTIMONY THAT COUNTS

PRAISE of the workings of woman suffrage which comes from governors and other elected officials of suffrage states does not count for much. These men are holding political offices, and they do not mean to offend needlessly any body of their constituents. What they say about the workings of woman suffrage is, therefore, to be taken with a very large grain of salt.

The Woman's Journal has made a considerable display of enthusiastic suffrage resolutions passed by the Colorado and Kansas legislatures. But these signify little. It could not be expected that members of these legislatures would run the risk of reprisals at the polls by voting against these complimentary expressions.

It is quite another matter when influential men in suffrage states, holding important non-political positions, speak frankly of the evils of woman suffrage, as seen at close range. Theirs is testimony that counts.

The latest instance of this kind is an interview with Judge W. H. Snell of Tacoma, Washington, in the Boston Post. Judge Snell favored woman suffrage in Washington, and voted for it. But he says now that "in common with thousands of others who looked at the question as an abstract proposition, and hoped for the best, I am so greatly disappointed at the way it has worked out that I would today welcome an opportunity to vote for its withdrawal." It appears that the promised "uplift" which was to have come through woman suffrage has not materialised. Judge Snell says:

"Many of us were led to support woman suffrage in Washington by the familiar argument that it would tend to purify politics and make for better government. But, after four years of experience, we are forced to conclude that it has done neither. On the contrary, it has simply added to the number of those who can be used in the interest of corrupt politics, and has resulted in a hodge-podge of ill-digested, sentimental, socialistic legislation, which is a menace to the welfare of the state."

It will be remembered that Judge Lindsey, ardent suffragist as he is, admits, from his experience in Colorado, that women in politics are "as free of the power of the Beast as men are, and no freer." Judge Snell fully agrees with him. He says:

"In Washington we have found that the same motives which control men in their exercise of the franchise also control women. Women are hired to do political work at so much per day, just as men are hired, except that women work cheaper. Women are actuated in their use of the ballot by the same selfish motives as men, and they look forward to securing political 'plums' for themselves or relatives in return for their political influence, just as men do,—and they get their reward, too. Our experience with woman suffrage in Washington is that women divide on public questions just as men divide, and when I say public questions I mean to include moral questions. Just as in the case of men, there is an element among the women of Washington who make a business of politics. And by business I mean mercenary and selfish business."

Such testimony as this cannot easily be discredited. It comes from a man who began by believing in suffrage and voting for it, but who has been disillusioned by four years' observation of its practical workings. Massachusetts men who do not care to see the same type of women brought to the front here who have made mercenary politics their business in Washington should make short work of the suffrage amendment next November.

MISS MARGARET FOLEY, speaking at Greenwood on the 19th of April, said: "The majority of Massachusetts women want the ballot, *only they do not know it.*" But how did Miss Foley penetrate their inner consciousness, and discover the longing of which they are not aware?

THE BOSTON AMERICAN recently printed a cartoon, labeled "Which are the Better Citizens?", showing on one side a long row of thugs and toughs, who are being marshaled to the polling place by a low-down boss, and on the other side an attractive row of bright and pretty women, carrying "Votes for Women" banners, and looking scornfully at the men in line. Under the cartoon is the inscription: "Those on One Side have the Vote. Do you Think Those on the Other Side Cannot be as Safely Trusted With It?" But the suffragists know perfectly well that the so-called "enfranchisement" of women does not mean giving the ballot only to such representatives of the sex as are pictured in this cartoon, but also to the ignorant, the degraded, the abandoned, fit associates of the thugs and toughs in the other row. Why do they persist in misrepresenting the issue?

HECKLING THE PRESIDENT

SUFFRAGISTS of the Congressional Union, under direct instructions from Mrs. Belmont, chose the days immediately following the sinking of the Lusitania,—when the whole nation was solemnized by the crisis—to heckle President Wilson. They laid siege to him for two days in the White House; followed him to Philadelphia, where he gave an address to newly-naturalized citizens; then pursued him to New York, where he went for the naval review; and threatened to intercept the Mayflower with a chartered launch. One leading suffragist at least,—Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt—publicly deprecated these proceedings, saying, "We are distressed that any person in the name of our cause should have attempted to intrude upon his peace of mind": but the incident will be remembered as one more proof of the recklessness and lack of self-control among the radical suffrage leaders.

SUFFRAGIST CONTRADICTIONS

IT is confusing to find recognized suffragists contradicting and confuting each other.

The familiar suffrage argument is that giving women the vote will elevate politics and purify society. The large business of government is described as merely "house-cleaning" in which women are supposed to be adept. A questionable bit of legislation is under discussion, and "Can any one imagine," say the suffragists, "that such a law would be possible if women had the vote?" They promise that the social evil, bad sanitation, impure milk, child labor, infant mortality and all the rest of the evils which afflict modern society will disappear when women are given the ballot. The commanding suffrage argument for forcing the ballot upon the great majority of women who do not want it is that, if they do not want it, they ought to, because of the tremendous benefits which they can confer upon the state by using it.

This is the line of suffrage argument with which we are all familiar. It is put forward in all seriousness, and many of those who use it are sincere. Anti-suffragists have experienced no difficulty in meeting it, point by point, but it is a little confusing to find the suffrage ground shifting, and the demand for the ballot based on directly opposite reasons.

Here is that staunch suffrage advocate, the New York Evening Post, talking editorially in this fashion, in its issue for April 13:

"Only in the excitable headlines did the women of Chicago decide last week's municipal election. The figures show that the outcome would have been the same if men alone had voted, or women alone had voted. To those who are accustomed to speak or think of 'the women's revolution,' the Chicago election has been a subject of chagrin. The event links itself up with Colorado, where woman suffrage did not prevent the horrors of Trinidad. It is impossible wholly to explain away the anti-suffrage argument, which cites the example of States where, without the suffrage, laws for the protection of women have been freely enacted. We cannot overlook the apparent inferences from the prohibition movement, revealing no direct connection between the vote of women and the elimination of the saloon. Of twelve prohibition states, only four have given the franchise to women. Of eleven suffrage states, only four have gone in for prohibition."

The Post goes on to argue that the war in Europe furnishes "another refutation of the argument that this world would immediately be much better if women had a full share in public affairs." The Post finds that "women and men in the warring nations are swayed by very much the same sentiments." This is a cruel brushing away of the suffrage argument that, if women in Europe had only had a vote, there would have been no war. But the Post finds "a fundamental argument for woman suffrage in the similar response of men and women to war madness in Europe, in the fact that women in Chicago divided largely on existing party lines, and in the fact that women in Colorado have not discovered a solution for the problems of capital and labor;" and it says:

"If men and women behave alike under the stimulus of a great war or of a municipal election, there is little left to the basic argument against woman suffrage, namely the essential differences between the sexes."

But it is the suffragists who have been claiming that there are essential differences between the sexes; that women have higher standards, clearer insight, and a more unselfish purpose, and that they ought to have the ballot in order that they may improve society.

The suffragists are at liberty to adopt either line of argument: to say that women are better than men, or that they are just the same as men. But they ought to see that they cannot use both, for, put in parallel columns, each destroys the other.

IDA HUSTED HARPER, in the Philadelphia Public Ledger for Dec. 27, 1914, said that the Federal Suffrage Association "hold that, under the First Article in the National Constitution, Congress has power to control the election of Representatives, and under the Sixteenth this power was extended to the election of Senators, and that it can secure the right of women to participate in these elections without any further amending of that instrument." As to the Sixteenth Article, that relates to the Income Tax. Presumably, Mrs. Harper means the Seventeenth, which deals with the election of Senators. But, both the First and Seventeenth Articles provide that "The electors in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislatures." Has Mrs. Harper overlooked that clause and the fact that in all the states except the suffrage states the prime qualification is that the electors shall be "male" citizens?

BACKWARD KANSAS

THE Russell Sage Foundation has been making an investigation of industrial conditions in Kansas. Its report is not encouraging.

Thirty-nine states and the District of Columbia have laws protecting women from long hours of labor. Kansas is one of the nine states which have no such laws. In some occupations, women are employed sixty hours a week or more.

Kansas has a child labor law,—such as it is,—but it is inadequate and it is loosely enforced. It prohibits the employment of children under fourteen in factories, workshops, theatres or packing houses, in operating elevators or in or about mines; but it says nothing about quarries, restaurants or laundries, in which occupations children were found working. It provides that children under sixteen shall not be employed in any occupation or place "dangerous or injurious to life, limb, health or morals," but this prohibition is too indefinite to be effective, and it leaves it to be determined what occupations or places fall within it.

Kansas has a workmen's compensation law; but the law leaves it optional with employers and employees to come under the law, and some of the largest employers of labor do not choose to come under it.

Altogether, this is not a brilliant showing for a state which has enjoyed the supposed benefits of woman suffrage for nearly three years.

THREE SUFFRAGE "RESULTS"

WRITING in the suffrage number of Harper's Weekly, Inez Haynes Gillmore enumerates three incidents which impressed themselves upon her, during a year's residence in California, as evidences of the beneficent workings of woman suffrage.

The first was the "Bundy case,"—the case of a young man of 18, who was convicted of murder and sentenced to be hanged. A class in the Oakland High School, composed of boys and girls, sent a petition to the Governor, protesting against the sentence, on the ground that a boy of 18 was too young to be executed. Mrs. Gillmore comments rapturously: "Imagine any High School class in any disfranchised state showing that degree of interest in public affairs and following it up by an immediate protest."

The second was the "Hazel Lux case,"—the case of a woman of the under-world who killed the man who, after taking her money to build a house, refused to marry her. "Immediately," says Mrs. Gillmore, "a steady procession of women filed to Hazel Lux's cell, to offer her assistance," and she adds: "That invasion of the cell of a so-called 'bad' woman by a crowd of so-called 'good' women seemed a sign of a universal awakening of women to the necessity of sex-solidarity."

The third event, which Mrs. Gillmore declares to be "much more thrilling," was the selection of a woman as vice-president of a Congressional campaign committee, and the consequent juxtaposition on the platform of "Mrs. Lowenfeld's tiny, slender, delicately-pretty femininity, with Mr. Gallagher's impressive two hundred and fifty pounds of ex-champion heavy-weight brawn."

Has not the suffrage reasoning reached rather a low level when three such incidents as these can be seriously put forward as arguments for suffrage?

HOW WOMAN SUFFRAGE IS WORKING OUT

In Nevada

(Editorial in the Boston Post, May 7)

Equal suffrage in Nevada was granted last fall. For the first time, the women exercised their right in Reno last Wednesday; and while the returns of that election are not exactly tabulated yet, the reform programme seems to be badly defeated.

The reform included two very essential provisions. One was an ordinance reducing the number of liquor licenses in Reno by one-half,—from 80 to 30 cafes and cabarets; the other was the ratification of the divorce law by which the scandal of the Reno divorce was recently revived.

So far as received, the returns indicate that Nevada has taken a step backward. It is announced that a majority of the new women voters came into line for a continuation of the divorce "colony"—the six months residence condition—and for liquor license in the capital.

Would the women alone have done this? Or did they trail along after a majority of "mere men" to the destruction of reform?

In Colorado

(Denver despatch in the New York World (Suffragist), May 19)

Three amendments voted on today in the municipal election were thought to be of special interest to the women voters, yet the suffrage vote signally failed to materialize, and, according to politicians, it was the lightest suffrage vote polled in Denver since Colorado became an equal suffrage state, twenty-two years ago. The amendments were for an industrial home for women, for city hospital improvements, and the "Home Rule" amendment. The first two were defeated and the last adopted. A snowstorm raged all day, but the most ardent suffragists said that the weather was not the cause of the falling off in the vote.

The city by a two to one majority voted to adopt the "Home Rule" amendment to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors. The State voted "dry" last fall, and the Prohibitionists assert that today's result will cause litigation and appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

ZEALOUS suffragists, who heckle anti-suffragist speakers, or hiss and jeer at them, as they did at the Faneuil Hall and Tremont Temple anti-suffrage meetings, or come up to the platform after a meeting to shake their fists in the face of an anti-suffrage speaker and tell her that she lies, as they have repeatedly done in this campaign, may find these demonstrations a relief to their feelings. But they should have sense enough to know that such exhibitions of ungoverned temper do not further the cause of "votes for women," but quite the contrary.

SOME SUFFRAGE FALLACIES

MISS HELEN TODD of California, puts a favorite suffrage argument in its baldest form when she says:

"Why should we be taxed without representation? That was the cause of the Revolution. *No class can or should govern another class.* Development consists in doing your own thinking; in making your own government and in doing your own voting. It is not possible for a home to be represented by a single vote. That one vote, even if it be cast for good government, is cancelled by the vote of a man who is supporting a grafter."

This brief paragraph contains five erroneous assumptions:

First, that American women, in male suffrage states, are taxed without representation in the sense in which the American colonies were taxed without representation in the British government.

Second, that women are a "class" who in the male suffrage states are governed by men as a "class."

Third, that, if women are given the ballot, they will be able to "make their own government."

Fourth, that it is impossible for a husband and father to represent the interests of his wife and children.

Fifth, that the vote of a good man, voting for good government, "is cancelled by the vote of a man who is supporting a grafter."

It is hardly necessary to do more than to state these assumptions to show how mistaken they are.

The American colonies were ruled and taxed by a government across the sea, in which they had neither direct nor indirect representation. There is no parallel between this and the lot of American women, whose interests are represented and guarded by their husbands and brothers.

No right-minded American man can be made to believe that his mother and sisters, his wife and daughters are a part of a "class" which needs protection against him and others like him.

Women who have the ballot will not be able to "make their own government." At the most, they can only assist in making the government under which both sexes live, in a community of interests.

The single vote, cast by a husband and father, does adequately represent the interests of his wife and children, for these interests are not hostile to his own, but hold the first place among his own.

It is not true that this vote, cast for good government, is necessarily or usually "cancelled by the vote of a man who is supporting a grafter." But, if it were true, would not the vote of the wife of the good man also be cancelled by the vote of the wife of the adherent of the grafter? That which calls itself "equal suffrage" cannot select the good, the intelligent, the disinterested women to use the ballot, but must put it in the hands of all, up and down the moral scale; and so must make it an imperative though irksome duty for women of the best type, however distasteful political activities may be to them, to "get out and hustle," as they were directed to do at Seattle, simply that they may offset the votes with which woman suffrage recruits the ranks of the saloon-keepers, the grafters and the Bathhouse Johns.

XANTHIPPE ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE

(Duffield Osborne in The Yale Review for April)

Xanthippe. I think, and I know you do, if half the nice things you've told Aspasia are true, that women are better and wiser than men, and therefore you can't deny that the government would be much better managed than it is now if we had our share in it.

Socrates. Do you think that women would cast their ballots more intelligently than do men?

Xanthippe. Perhaps not more intelligently at the beginning. We need education in such matters, but it would not be long before a state in which the women voted would stand on a much higher plane than does the Athens of to-day.

Socrates. Ultimately, then, you believe that the women would vote and govern more wisely than the men?

Xanthippe. Yes.

Socrates. And that must of necessity be because they are more intelligent and more able?

Xanthippe. I think we are.

Socrates. Will you tell me on what you base your opinion as to the greater intelligence and ability of women?

Xanthippe. Is not Aspasia more intelligent than her charioteer?

Socrates. Very much more intelligent, but you are selecting a high type of woman and a low type of man.

Xanthippe. If we voted we would all be of a higher type.

Socrates. Then why is not the charioteer now more intelligent than Aspasia, if the opportunity of voting confers such qualities?

Xanthippe. I don't know, but I think it would improve women.

Socrates. Perhaps so, but, of course, that is only an opinion. As it stands, in estimating fairly the relative intelligence and ability of the sexes, must we not compare the highest with the highest and the lowest with the lowest?

Xanthippe. Well?

Socrates. With all due respect to Aspasia, then, and a full realization of the peril I brave in asking, do you think she is the equal of Pericles in wisdom and ability?

Aspasia. Banish your fear, my dear Socrates, I am not, and I know enough to know it.

Socrates. Of course, all these are, as I have said, mere opinions, but is it not certain that, in order to improve the electorate by admitting a new class of voters, the general intelligence and ability of that class must be higher than of those who now vote? Surely if the best women are only as wise as men who are less than the best and so on down the scale, there will be a loss in the guiding wisdom of the mass.

Xanthippe. Why yes, but—

THE suffragists continue to ascribe whatever "dry" gains are made in Illinois to the women's vote. But similar gains are made in neighboring states where only men vote; and Indiana, a state which has steadily rejected woman suffrage, has 65 per cent. of its population in "dry" territory, while Illinois has only 42 per cent.

AS TO INFANT MORTALITY

THE latest report of the New York State Board of Health shows that the rate of infant mortality—the number of deaths of infants under one year to every thousand children born—was only 94 in New York City in 1914. The figure fell by eight points from 1913, when it was 102. In the aggregate of all the cities of the state, the rate fell by nine points from 1913 to 1914. If such an improvement as this had been recorded in any suffrage state, we should have the suffragists attributing it to "votes for women"; but it has taken place in a male-suffrage state, under man-made laws, and it is attributable to the life-saving work of the State Health Department, and the increasing attention paid to pure milk and tenement-house sanitation.

The suffragists have had a good deal to say about the lowered rate of infant mortality in Finland, following woman suffrage. But Finland has a population of only 3,140,000, scattered over an area twice as large as New England, at the rate of 25 to the square mile. New York City has a population of about 5,000,000, of all nationalities, crowded together at the rate of 15.6 persons to a dwelling. Yet the Finland infant-mortality rate is 117, while that of New York City is only 94.

As The Woman's Journal is fond of saying: "Comment is superfluous."

SUFFRAGE AND THE SALOONS

TEMPERANCE people who imagine that "votes for women" are certain to help their cause should keep their eyes open to what is going on in the suffrage states.

Women voted for the first time at Reno on the 5th of May. One of the questions before the voters was a proposed reduction in the number of cafes and cabarets. Did the women flock to the polls to vote in favor of the proposal? Not at all. They went to the polls in good numbers, but a majority of them voted in favor of keeping the full number of saloons. They demonstrated what Miss Margaret Foley has so often declared in this State, that men need not fear having their beer taken away from them through the votes of women. It would appear from this that Nevada is not likely to lose, through woman suffrage, its established reputation as the State having more retail liquor establishments in proportion to the population, less proportionate territory under no-license, and more people living in wet territory in proportion than any other state in the Union.

There was an election in Denver on the 18th of May. One of the leading issues was the ratification of the so-called "Home Rule" amendment. Colorado voted last year for state-wide prohibition. The purpose of the "Home Rule" amendment was to take Denver out from under the state prohibition provisions and to make it a law to itself in the regulation of the liquor traffic. The proposal is an anomaly, and its constitutionality is certain to be brought before the United States Supreme Court. But it was adopted by a two-to-one vote, the women contributing to this result.

Clearly in these states woman suffrage and temperance movements are not going "hand-in-hand."

WHERE WERE THE WOMEN VOTERS?

THIS is the question which Judge Lindsey put, in his address at Denver on the occasion of the celebration of Susan B. Anthony's birthday. And here is his reason for putting it:

"When we asked for the employee compensation bill, where were the women voters of Denver? When protests were entered, I looked around for some of our women voters to plead for the poor women and children who would be benefited by this bill, but there was not a woman present. Where is our adult probation law? We are a suffrage state. Massachusetts is not, but they have an adult probation law. Where is our home-finding society? We have suffrage, but our dependent children in this state are put in homes for dependent children, instead of being given the rights of family ties. We are twenty years behind Massachusetts in spite of suffrage."

That is a candid admission. But suffrage orators in Massachusetts will go right on holding up Colorado as an example for Massachusetts to follow.

THE suffrage edition of The Boston American pointed proudly to the fact that Jess Willard, the world's champion pugilist, comes from the suffrage state of Kansas, and asked: "Who said that American men will become effeminate if they give their sisters equal rights?" The idea that two years of woman suffrage might make a prizefighter effeminate is a novel one, and The American should copyright it.

MASSACHUSETTS women, who are lightly told by the suffragists that suffrage involves nothing more than five minutes spent in marking a ballot on the way to market, should bear in mind that, besides the time needed to become familiar with parties, issues and candidates, it carries with it, in this State, full responsibility for jury duty. Section 1, Chapter 176, of the revised laws of Massachusetts provides: "A person qualified to vote for representatives to the General Court shall be liable to serve as a juror."

THE suffragists of the Congressional Union did not achieve much with Senator O'Gorman of New York when they called on him, 200 strong, April 30, to urge him to support the Susan B. Anthony amendment. The Senator said to them:

"The sole effect of the proposed amendment would be to force woman suffrage on States that are opposed to it. Why do you abandon the method by which you have secured eleven States? Those States have adopted it without compulsion, and why deprive other States of the same privilege? Remember, what is good for a western State, with a sparse population, may not be desirable for New York. You who are here represent a large and influential element, but I could assemble in another room an equal number of women who do not desire the ballot."